



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/237,718 01/26/99 LANDSMAN

R UNICAST-1CIP

007265

TM02/0828

MICHAELSON AND WALLACE
PARKWAY 109 OFFICE CENTER
328 NEWMAN SPRINGS RD
P O BOX 8489
RED BANK NJ 07701

EXAMINER

CARLSON, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED:

08/28/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/237,718

Applicant(s)

LANDSMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Carlson

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-10, 12-18, 20-25, 27-33, 35, 37-44, 46-52, 54-59, 61-67, 69, 71-78, 80-86, 88-93, 95-102 and 104-108 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.



Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12,14

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)

Office Action Summary

Part of Paper No. 21

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 3-10,12-18,20-25,27-33,35,37-44,46-52,54-59,61-67,69,71-78,80-86,88-93,95-102 and 104-108.

Art Unit: 2162

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the paper(s) filed 5/30/01.

Drawings

2. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on 5/30/01. These drawings are approved by the examiner.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because it contains several instances of embedded hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.
4. The substitute specification has been approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claims 107, 37-44, 46-52, 54-59, 61-67 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claim 107 line 18, there is no clear antecedent basis for the further file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2162

7. Claims 3-10, 12-18, 20-25, 27-33, 35, 37-44, 46-52, 54-59, 61-67, 69, 71-78, 80-86, 88-93, 95-102 and 104-108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judson (US5737619) in view of Capek et al (US6094677). Judson teaches the desire to display locally cached information (such as ads [col. 2 line 2, col. 7 lines 22-25]) to a user's web browser while the user waits for requested page content to be downloaded. Judson states that text or image content could be displayed during such wait periods. In the case of images, the embedded code provides a link to the address of the image file; the content of the image file providing the message/advertisement. This is an example of using tag code to decouple the message/ad/object content from the first web page. Judson describes several processes/tests that determine/control browser function in order to implement the invention. Column 6 lines 13-16 describe that step 74 provides a test to determine whether a link associated with the object/ad is activated. Column 6 lines 18-28 describe a process where the client retrieves and displays the ad object in parallel with the downloaded of the requested content page. Step 84 includes a test/routine to determine whether the display is complete and allows the display of the requested content page. Column 7 lines 25-33 describe *programming* at the browser level to insert ads randomly, or even selective ads according to the user's history. Column 8 lines 30-43 describe the use of browser-executed Java applets (inherently include scripts and server url) to implement interactive/dynamic ads. Capek et al also describes methods to insert information (inserts can be ads [col. 8 lines 3+]) during delays in retrieving browser requested pages/information. Capek et al describes the use of

Art Unit: 2162

browser executed applets to accomplish several features such as detecting a client request for remote information [col 7 lines 18-23], determining the future delay duration [col 10 lines 9-12], and selecting relevant ads based on the users profile [col 5 lines 9-12]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided code-based applets with that of Judson in a manner as taught by Capek et al so that the tests and routines of Judson can be accomplished. Capek et al teaches the identification of each ad as well as the queuing of ads and playing the ads in a particular order [col 8 line 59 to col 9 line 5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have downloaded the ads sequentially in the same order as they are to be played. The managers described by Capek et al can be taken to be "agents". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have implemented the programming/managers as persistent within the user's browsing session so that other session-specific functions can be carried out as is well known, such as time of session tracking and customizing the ads for the specific user's session. Column 12 lines 39-42 describe a process of checking the configuration of the user's computer to determine whether a particular type of ad can be played back/displayed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have included a file describing the ad identity (as above) as well as the configuration options needed to successfully play the ad. Regarding claim 12, a new user session would inherently download and invoke the most recently stored applet, however it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 2162

to have checked for more recent versions so as to enable programming changes immediately.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 703-308-3402. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6p, off on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-6606 for regular communications and 703-305-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Jeffrey D. Carlson
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

jdc
August 23, 2001